3

Previous references.

B. Jrly c 685 1-4. S.R. 156-05

File No. 60-02

1902

Serial Nos. 1-4

(Sep ; Revs)

Later references.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 1— 4

Part B. for June 08

SUBJECT.

Inamdar's claim to the toddy revenue of Kayamputta arasanahalli peddanahalli village, Devanahalli Tq

1) From the Excise Comm^r No. 5001/3398 27/3/03 Submits with his opinion the records of enquiry relating to the toddy revenue of Kayamputta Arasakanahalli peddanahalli, devanahalli Tq

2) To the Excise Comm^r = No. 158/En.7.1601 & 20.8.03. Observes that the decision is incorrect & the enquiry incomplete and requests him to submit a correct and a full decision.

3) From the Excise Comm^r. No. 9819 7.5.04

G. R. S. 58

submit with his opinion the records of enquiry ~~relating to the~~ relating to the two by excise revenue, ordered in serial (2) above.

(4) To the Excise Commr;
——— Comptroller;
——— Dram Supdt.;
No. 7964/49-50 & 11.6.08
Disallowed the Inamdar's claim.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(Sep Rev)

NOTES.

File No. 60-02

FILE HEADING.

Iramidan's claim to the toddy revenue of Kayamgutta Arasanahalli Peddanahalli village, Devanhalli Talug

From

The Excise Commissioner in Mysore.

No. 5001/339 Dated 27.2.03 Received 28.2.03.

Diary No. 347	Enclos.	Spare Copies.	Serial No. 1.

BRIEF ABSTRACT OF LETTER.

Submitting with his opinion the record of enquiry relating to the toddy revenue of Kayamgutta Arasanahalli Peddanahalli village, Devanhalli Tq

~~NOTES AND ORDERS.~~

2. To the Excise Commissioner
No 158/Ex F. 16-01 & 20/8/03
Observes that the decision is incorrect & the inquiry incomplete and requests him to submit a correct and full decision.

NOTES—First sheet.

GPB—30,000—20-3-06.

G352 3

G. R. S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

ಕಂದಾ File No. 60 of 1902

Serial No.

(1) ಮೂಲ

From the Contractor. If necessary the old accounts of 1835, 1836 & 1840 may be examined by Ver. Records to find out if the Cess revenue has been alienated. The list prepared in the Chief Com's Office (Cess Duffer no 670) which has been submitted with Gredaferuchalli Claim may also be examined.

ಮೂಲಕ 2
ಕಂ. 59-02
19/5/14

No doubt there has been no proof of long continued enjoyment of this revenue by the Inamdar & no 4/plus of the Inamdar is available submitted for orders

ಪಾಲಕ್ಕಿ-
20. 5. 08
ಶಿರಸಿ

19.5.08

From no 233

To Ver. Records

ಮೂಲ

To. no 219

ಈ ಮೇಲಿನಂತೆ 1, 2 ಕಾಲಮುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಕಳಿಸಿದ್ದೆಂ / ಕಿವಿಮಾತುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಇದಿಷ್ಟು ಕಿಲಿಂಗೆ ಆಗಿದ್ದು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರ ಪೈಕಿ ಕೆಲವು ಪೈಕಿ, ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವು ಪೈಕಿ, ಆಸಿಲಾವಳಿಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಮಂಜೂರು ಇನಾಮಿನ ಪೈಕಿ ಕೆಲವು ಪೈಕಿ ಪೈಕಿ ಪೈಕಿ

G. R. S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

S.R. File No. 60 of 1902

Serial No.	
V-	reserved to Govt. at the time of Inam Settlement.
n	(4) The Inamdar himself speaks of sendi trees + the yield therefrom in his applications for his claim to the toddy revenue of the village.
y	(5) The village has only a Grove + no Shop.
y	(6) The Inamdar has not adduced any proof as to his enjoyment of toddy rev: for 12 years preceding the year 1901-2.

The Inamdar does not seem therefore to be entitled to anything beyond the tree rent. And as he has been permitted to lease out his own trees from 1896-7 all that he is entitled to is, one-fifth of the Grove rent under rule 4 of Govt. Order dtd 2.8.01.

Submitted with a draft.

K.S.
21/5/08.

J V R

22/5 The Babichetty of 1878 & the Panchala Muthuvalu list forthcoming in his file are unauthenticated documents & are therefore inadmissible in evidence.

Sd/ 22/5.

NOTE—Contn sheet.

GPB—50 000—17-3-07

Excise Commissioner's office !
Bangalore. Dated 24th/27th February 1903.

No. 5001/389 Rue 1 File

S.R. 60-02-1.

From

P.N. Purnaiya Esquire B.A.
Excise Commissioner
in Mysore

To

H. V. Nunjundiah Esqre M.A. M.L.
Secretary to the Government of
H.H. The Maharaja of Mysore
General & Revenue Department

Sir,

In submitting herewith the record of Enquiry relating to the Toddy Revenue of Kayamgutta Arasanahalli Peddanahalli village, Devanhalli Taluk, I have the honour to state that I concur in the investigating officers' findings that the Kayamguttadar is not entitled to Excise Revenue from Toddy. The Sannad of the village shows that ½ pagoda "On account of date trees" is included in the assets of the Beriz of the village mentioned in it. This is

apparently

E4347.

OFFICE OF
Regd 9527
28 FEB. 1903

1903

From P. N. Purnaiya Esq^re BA
Excise Commissioner
in Mysore

To H. V. Nunjundiah Esq^re MA M
Secretary to Govt of H.H. the
Maharaja of Mysore
General & Revenue Dept^s

Dated 24th
Despatched 25th } February 1903.
Received

General No. 5031
No. 327

Enclosure No.

Subject

Submits with his opinion the record of enquiry relating to the Toddy Revenue of ~ Kayangutta Arasanahalli Peddanhalli village, Devanhalli Taluk.

Agent
28.2.03

Proceedings of the Government of His Highness

the Maharaja of Mysore.

S.R 60-02-2

Read:--

The marginally noted letters from the Excise Commissio
er in Mysore submitting the records of enquiring into the claims
to excise revenue of the Inams
noted in the Margin.

Letter No.6068/364 on the Inamdar's claim to toddy Revenue of Siddanhalli village, Anekal Taluk.
Letter No.6 5/369 on the Inamdar's claim to toddy revenue of Savipalya village, Kolaramgala Taluk.
Letter No.6066/356 -do- -do-
Pradesanhalli, Devanhalli taluk.
Letter No.6065/359 -do- -do-
Kolhalli, Devanhalli Taluk.
Letter No.6001/359 -do- -do-
Arasanahalli, Reddanahalli, -do- Taluk.
Letter No.5461/359 -do- -do-
Thanetalingapura, Anekal Taluk.
Letter No.5499/357 -do- -do-
Itagalpura, Doddaballapur Taluk.
Letter No.5496/363 -do- -do-
Chikkanahalli, -do- -do-
Letter No.6063/363 -do- -do-
Thamacandera, Anekal Taluk.

Order thereon No.159/Ex.F.16-01,
Dated, Bangalore 26th ~~April~~ August 1903.

In every case read above the investigating officer, Mr D.J. Kumaraswami Naik, B.A., records the findings that the claimants are entitled to $\frac{1}{5}$ of tree-rent up to 03-99 and they are entitled to full tree rent for the succeeding years.

2. Government regret to observe that the decision is incorrect and the enquiry is incomplete. The first portion of the decision being under rule 3 of Government Proceeding No.2073-03/R.F.166-02-1, dated the 2nd August 1901, of grove Farm rent towards tree rent up to 03-07 alone ought to have been awarded.

3. The needful information for the second finding of the investigating officer which falls under rules 6 and 17 of the Proceeding quoted above, was not before him; and hence it is a decision based on no evidence.

4. The Excise Commissioner states he concurs with the investigating officer; but awards 1/5 of Gorvo Darn rent only under rule 4 without noticing the other finding of the latter.

5. The decision and the enquiry being this defective, Government direct that the records of enquiry be remitted to the investigating officer for completing the enquiry and for recording a correct and full decision.

For Secretary to Government.

To

The Excise Commissioner in Mysore.

.V.

43525R

Office of the Excise Commissioner
in Mysore,

No. 9817 In 481 file

Dated Bangalore, 7 th May 1908.

S.R. 60-02-3.

From

H.H. Sparkes Esquire,
Excise Commissioner, in Mysore.

To

C.S. Balasundram Iyer Esquire, B.A.,
Offg. Secretary to the Government of
His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore,
General & Revenue Departments.

Sir,

I have the honor to submit herewith the marginally noted correspondence and the records of investigation relating to the Inamdars' claim to the Excise revenue from toddy of Kayamgutta Arsanahalli Peddanahalli village in the Devanahalli Taluk together with a copy of the Inam Register of enquiry and to state that the village has only a date grove but no toddy shop.

1. Letter No.A.203 dated 27-12-07 from the Deputy Commissioner, Bangalore District.
2. Letter No.146 dated 23-4-07 from the Senior Assistant Commissioner, Dodballapur Sub-Division to the Deputy Commissioner Bangalore District.
3. Docket No. 43 dated 16-9-95 from the Deputy Commissioner, Bangalore District.

2. The village was granted on the 8th December 1829 by Fouzdar Thimmapparajiah Urs on Kayamgutta tenure, the gutta amount being 44 pagodas and 2 fanams. In the Sannad half a pagoda is shown in the details of the receipts of the village on account of toddy trees. But at the Inam Settlement conducted in 1878 all rights to Abkari have been reserved to Government. The Inamdar in proof of his enjoyment has produced the marginally noted documents. Though in the Mutchilka it is mentioned that the toddy shop is to be held in a certain locality the document is essentially an agreement to pay tree rent at the rate of Six Annas per tree tapped in the Inam village. The Baki Patti does not make mention of

1. Mutchilka dated 8-8-1875.
2. Baki Patti of Iswara Samvatsara.
3. Panchasal Huttuvali from 1877 to 1882.

of any Shendi bab specifically. The Panchasal Huttuvali does not say whether the income is the tree rent or the Excise revenue from toddy. The Inamdar has not produced any proof as to his enjoyment of the Excise revenue from toddy of the village during the period of fifty years prior to 1892 or even during the twelve years immediate -ly preceding the said year.

3. In the above circumstances, I concur in the opinions recorded by the investigating officer and the Deputy Commissioner that the Inamdar is not entitled to the Excise revenue from toddy of the village. Accordingly only 1/5 th of the Grove Farm rent is payable to the Kayamguttadar under rule 4 in Government Notification No. 2074-83/R.F. 166-92 dated 2 nd August 1901.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

your most obedient servant

for Excise Commissioner, in Mysore.

Bangalore District.

Deputy Commissioner's Office,

Dated. 26/27th December 1907.

From,

D. Devaraj Urs Esquire.

Deputy Commissioner,

Bangalore District.

To,

H. H. Sparkes, Esquire,

Excise Commissioner in Mysore.

Sir,

With reference to your letter No. 98, dated 19/21st September 1905, returning certain files of records relating to the enquiry into the toddy claims, I have the honor to retransmit herewith the files of the marginally noted villages received with the Doddaballapur Sub Division, Assistant Commissioner's letter No. 1146, dated 23rd April 1907 (copy of which is enclosed) and to state as follows:-

1. Gowribidanur - Mallasandra Taluk
2. Chikkanahalli } Doddaballapur Taluk
3. Hagalpura }
4. Arabenahalli } Devanhalli Taluk
5. Kyamanahalli }
Gollahalli }

The amounts due to the Inamdars of the several villages quoted above under Rule 4 of Government Proceedings No. 2074-83/R.F.166-9, dated 2nd August 1907, are recorded in the revised calendars of each case submitted by Mr. Ramaswami Naick.

2. It would appear from the records that these Inamdars have been allowed to lease out the toddy trees themselves subsequent to 1896-97, and as such they are not entitled to get anything on account of rent during the year 1897-98 in which preliminary tree tax system was introduced and the subsequent years in which the tree tax system was brought into force.

3. The groves of the Inam villages of Ardesahalli, Arsandhalli, Puddanhalli and Gollahalli in the Devanhalli

Taluk

Taluk and Gavopalya in the Nelamangala Taluk were not sold independently but sold clubbed together with other villages from 1892-93 to 1894-95. Thus the amounts awarded for these years in the calendors of those villages appear to have been arrived at by the ~~appointment~~ apportionment of the grove farms rent among the villages whose groves were sold together. The other files of records relating to the villages of Siddenahalli, Kantalingapura and Komasundra referred to in the letter under reference will be submitted soon after their receipt from the Assistant Commissioner, Bangalore Sub Division.

I have the honor to be etc.,

(Sd) D. Devaraj Urs,

Deputy Commissioner,

Bangalore District.

"C O P Y."

for Excise Commissioner,

in Mysore.

From,

K. R. Sreenevasiengar Esquire,

Senior Assistant Commissioner,

Dodballapur.

To,

H. H. Sparkes, Esquire,

Deputy Commissioner,

Bangalore District.

Dated 18th April 1907.

No. 1146.

Sir,

With reference to your memo No. 127, dated 18th October 1905, forwarding for further enquiry the papers relating to the claims of toddy revenue of the Inamdars of the marginally noted villages, I have the honor to report as follows:-

1. Ganigalaya Hadamangalam
2. Chikkanahalli
3. Hagalpura Doddaballapur
4. Aravanahalli
5. Aravanahalli Doddanahalli
6. Gollahalli

Devanhally Taluk

From the enquiry held by my predecessors, it is clear that the Inamdars of none of the 6 villages in question are ~~liable~~ entitled to the toddy revenue of these villages. The only question for determination is the amount of refund to which these Inamdars may be entitled under Rules 4, 8 and 17 of the Rules published in Government Order No. 2074-83/R.F. 166-92, dated 2nd August 1901.

2. As regards the claims of the Inamdars for 1/5 of the grove farm rent under rule 4, the revised calendars of each case submitted by Mr. Kumerswami Naick give the grove farm rents in the villages in question realized during the years 1892-93 to 1896-97 and the 1/5 portion thereof refundable to the Inamdars. I am unable to make out where from the figures given in the calendars for the grove farm rentals during the

above

above five years were obtained. I see that these figures differ slightly from those furnished to me by the Amildars to whom I made a reference in the matter. I may also add that I have not been able to obtain from the District office full information regarding the grove farm rentals realized during the five years in question.

3. As regards the claims under Rules 8 and 17 notices were issued to the Inamdars and such of them as appeared were heard in support of their claims; none of them could give definite and accurate information which would entitle them to any refun d of tree rent. It is ascertained from Deputy Commissioner's yadi No. 158, dated 9th November 1906, and also from the reports of the Amildars that from the years 1897-98 the date trees in the Inam villages in question were leased out by the Inamdars themselves and that Government did not place any restriction on their so leasing out the trees or recover any tree rent from trees leased out in these villages. Hence no refund is due to the Inamdars of these villages towards tree rent under Rules 16 and 17 either for the year 1897-98 when the preliminary tree tax system was brought into force or during the subsequent years when the tree tax system was fully into operation.

4. I desire to invite your attention to the statement submitted by the Amildar of Devanhalli wherefrom it is seen that a sum of Rs. 350-3-8 has already been advanced to the Inamdars of Gollahalli though the amount refundable to him under rule 4 amounts to only Rs. 98-6-5.

5. The records received with the memo under report as also the records of further enquiries held in this office are herewith submitted as per/erist.

I have the honor to be etc.
(Sd) Thumboo Chetty,
for Senior Assistant Commissioner,
Dodballapur Division.

" C O P Y."

(Sd) D. Devaraj Urs,

Deputy Commissioner,

Bangalore District.

" C O P Y."

for Excise Commissioner,

in Mysore.

12

190

From D.Devaraj Urs Esq,
Deputy Commissioner,
Bangalore District.

To
P.N.Purnaiya Esq, B.A.,
Excise Commissioner,
in Mysore.

Dated 16-9-1905.
Despatched
Received
General No. 43
No.

Enclosure No. Record.

His docket No. 31 dated 22nd August 1905, returning the file of papers relating to the enquiry into the claims to toddy revenue of Kayam--gutta Anarasanahalli Peddanahalli villages in the Devanahalli Taluk, for retransmission with the Deputy Commis--sioner's opinion on the finding of the investigation officer.

With reference to the above, has the honor to state that the undersigned fully agrees with the views of the investigating officer.

(Sd) D.Devaraj Urs
Deputy Commissioner.

" C O P Y "

for Excise Commissioner,
in Mysore.

G.R.S. 28]

3 copies.

File No. 60-02
Serial No. 4.

Diary No. of letter replied to 4352

Proceedings of the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.
(S.R.)

, the 190

Date of issue 11 June/08

Signed by J.W. Balasundaram Dy

READ— Corr. ending with the Sheristadar's letter, No. 9817 dated 7.5.08, submitting the record of enquiry relating to the claim of the Inamdar of Aravanahalli Peddanahalli in the Devanhalli Taluk to the toddy revenue of the village

ORDER THEREON.—No.

No H 6449-50 order thereon:—
8/11-6-08 The Kowalgutta village of Aravanahalli Peddanahalli in the Devanhalli Taluk was

over

SUBJECT

GPB—10,000—10-4-06

granted in the 2nd Dec. 1829 to
the Zamindar of Kurnagutta Venkata-Rau, in Kurnagutta Venur
by Sangam Venkatappayya.
2) The village has above two
hills, &c.
(3) In the records filed by the
pandit Ishwar from the
Zamindar to the Amildar
there is no, which is
a proof in the dispute
as to the right of the village, on
account of 2 or 3 lines. Infi-
-ction of the settlement rendered
in 1871 all rights to Mallavi V.
have been granted to pat.
(4) The phraseology employed
the inscription of 1530 denotes only
[illegible] the
hire and is about sixty pitchadi D.
for the customary phrase
Sukha = hostali = [illegible]
[illegible]
which is found in almost the whole
of the inscriptions now [illegible]
are specifically mentioned
either in the Baki patti of 1877-8 or in
that of the subsequent Zamindari Settlement.

S
R
Mr. Boyle
Mr. Fitz
Mr. Venkata
Mr. Venkata
Mr. Venkata

G.R.S. 27]

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(*Continuation Sheet draft form.*)

(4) In the foregoing circumstances, I agree with the Excise Board that the Kayamkulbadan is entitled only to the 1/5th of the grove farm rent payable to him under rule 4 appended to G.O No: 2074-83/Rev 166-92 dtd the 2nd August 1901.

6 No reference is made in this order to the Bake Patta of Eruma (1877-78) & the Panchakale Kuthaki lists, as these are mentioned therein & therefore inadmissible

mentioned in the Excise Cir to Dists

1 print

30 May 08

Sd/ to put to the Excise Board with the records

The complete set of transcripts

K.S. 2/5/08

2/5/08

Approved

1907-08

GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS
THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE

FINANCIAL
(SEPARATE REVENUE)

PROCEEDINGS

Dated 11th June 1908

No. Fl. 6449-50 / S. R. 60 of 02-4

Disallowing the claim of the Inamdar of Arsanahalli Peddanahalli in the Devanhalli Taluk, to the toddy excise revenue of the village.

GPB—31-7-03—210

Proceedings of the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore, Financial, (Separate Revenue), dated 11th June 1908.

READ—

Correspondence ending with the Excise Commissioner's letter No. 9817, dated the 7th May 1908, submitting the record of enquiry relating to the claim of the Inamdar of Arsanahalli Peddanahalli in the Devanhalli Taluk to the toddy revenue of the village.

No. FL. 6449-50—S. R. 60-02-4, DATED BANGALORE, 11TH JUNE 1908.

ORDER THEREON.—The village of Arsanahalli Peddanahalli in the Devanhalli Taluk was granted to one Venkata Rao on Kayamgutta tenure on the 8th December 1829 by Fouzdar Thimmapparaja Urs.

2. The village has a grove and no toddy shop.

3. In the Nirup dated the 17th January 1830, issued from the Fouzdar to the Amildar of Devanhalli, half a pagoda is shown in the details of the receipts of the village, on account of Sendi trees; but at the Inam Settlement conducted in 1878 all rights to Abkari have been reserved to Government.

4. The phraseology employed in the Nirup of 1830 describes only date trees and is clearly distinguishable from the customary phrases of the time such as Sendi Hootwali, "Panchabab" or "Abkari" which denote the whole of excise revenue from toddy.

5. In the foregoing circumstances Government agree with the Excise Commissioner that the Kayamguttadar is entitled only to the one-fifth of the Grove Farm rent payable to him under Rule 4 appended to Government Order No. 2074-83—R.F. 166-92, dated the 2nd August 1901.

6. No reference is made in this order to the Baki Patti of Eswara (1877-78) and the Panchabab Hutwali lists mentioned in the Excise Commissioner's letter as these are unattested documents and therefore inadmissible.

K. S. CHANDRASEKHARA AIYAR,
Secy. to Govt., Gen. & Rev. Depts.

To—The Excise Commissioner in Mysore with enclosures.
The Comptroller in Mysore.
The Superintendent of Inam Settlements in Mysore.

Exd.—C. S.